

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

10 CHAO KANG LIN,

11 Petitioner,

12 v.

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

14 Respondent.
15

CASE NO. C05-660RSM
(CR01-158RSM)

ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE
OF APPEALABILITY

16 On January 17, 2006, petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal, which was construed by the
17 Court as a petition for Certificate of Appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253. To obtain such a
18 certificate and proceed with an appeal of the denial of a petition for habeas corpus, the petitioner
19 must make a “substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C.
20 § 2253(c)(2). To make such a showing, petitioner “must demonstrate that the issues are
21 debatable among jurists of reason; that a court could resolve the issues [in a different manner];
22 or that the questions are ‘adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.’” *Barefoot v.*
23 *Estelle*, 463 U.S. 880, 893 n. 4 (1983) (citations omitted).

24 As petitioner has submitted no separate statement of issues for appeal, the Court has
25 reviewed his objections to the Report and Recommendations (“R&R”) issued in his case. That
26 R&R recommended the denial of petitioner’s § 2255 motion for relief from his sentence based

1 on the Supreme Court's decisions in *Blakely v. Washington*, 124 S. Ct. 2531 (2004) and *United*
2 *States v. Booker*, 125 S. Ct. 738 (2005), because neither of those cases apply retroactively.
3 (Dkt. #13 at 4). The R&R also recommended the denial of petitioner's motion based on
4 ineffective assistance of counsel, finding that petitioner failed to meet the standard for relief on
5 that basis. The Court adopted the R&R, simply noting that, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
6 had recently held that *Blakely* – and therefore *Booker* – does not apply retroactively to cases on
7 collateral review, and therefore, Judge Benton correctly determined that petitioner may not rely
8 upon *Booker* in support of his motion to vacate. (Dkt. #17).

9 The Court finds that reasonable jurists would find no debatable issue here. The Ninth
10 Circuit Court of Appeals has made clear that *Blakely* and therefore *Booker* do not apply
11 retroactively, and this Court is bound by that determination. The Ninth Circuit has also made
12 clear that an *Apprendi* argument in this case would have been futile, and therefore, counsel's
13 failure to preserve such an argument does not constitute ineffective assistance of counsel.
14 Accordingly, the Court finds that petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing of a denial
15 of a constitutional right, and his petition for Certificate of Appealability is DENIED. *See* 28
16 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

17 The Clerk shall forward a copy of this Order to petitioner and all counsel of record.

18 DATED this 7 day of February 2006.

19 

20 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26